REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the above amendment, the claims will be 1 to 27.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation that claims 6 to 10 and 12 to 14 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. However, for reasons set forth below, it is considered that all of the present claims are now in condition for allowance.

In this regard, claim 6 has been rewritten per the Examiner's indication of allowability, in the form of present claim 16.

New claims 17 to 27 ultimately depend on new claim 16 but cover the content of original claims 2, 3 and 7 to 15, respectively.

The above amendment is responsive to points set forth in the Official Action.

With regard to the comment concerning the specification, it has been arranged substantially along the lines of the Examiner's suggestion. Copies of the original specification and abstract are attached hereto as "Substitute Specification" and "Version With Markings to Show Changes Made". No new matter has been added.

With regard to the objection to claim 1 in Official Action paragraph 4, the Examiner's suggestion has been adopted.

Claims 2 and 3 have been amended responsive to the rejections in Official Action paragraph 6.

Claims 1-5, 11, and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klingler (EP 261 890 A2) in view of Maddox et al. (U.S. 2002/0132059 A1) and vice versa.

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Maddox et al. is very broad and without giving any example or specific composition, Maddox claims any photo-polymerizable composition (see claim 1). On page 4, paragraph [0109], Maddox et al. states that the coating formulation includes monomers and oligomers having the capacity of being cured by light radiation.

Applicants have found that not all photo-polymerizable compositions satisfy the coating process of the invention. As can be seen from the Comparative Example 47R (see present specification at page 15, line 29 to page 16, line 5 and Table 2, page 17), radiation curable compositions comprising a photo-polymerizable oligomer, which are very similar to the compositions as described in claim 1, do not provide good results when used in the process according to the invention.

Applicants have surprisingly found that the specific compositions as recited in the present claims, provide an improved balance of surface hardness, flexibility and surface hardness.

These unexpected properties are not disclosed nor suggested by Klingler. Indeed, Klingler is related to printing applications. Moreover, Klingler teaches that twice maleated polybutadienes are preferred for this application, which are the reaction products of the methacrylated maleated polybutadiene, reacted in a second step with maleic anhydride (see Example 2, page 8) and hence teaches away from the methacrylated maleated polybutadienes which are covered by present claim 1.

Hence in view of Klingler, the one skilled in the art would not select from among all possible photo-polymerizable oligomers as covered by Maddox et al., the compositions according to present claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 and all claims dependent thereon are not obvious over Maddox et al. in view of Klingler.

No further issues remaining, allowance of all claims is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or proposals for expediting prosecution, please contact undersigned at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

Isabelle FALLAIS et al.

By: Matthus M. Jacob

Registration No. 25,154 Attorney for Applicants

MJ/aas Washington, D.C. 20006-1021 Telephone (202) 721-8200 Facsimile (202) 721-8250 April 10, 2007